

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 were pending in this application. Dependent claims 6-9 have been withdrawn from consideration pursuant to the previous restriction requirement. In response to the Office Action dated March 14, 2006, claims 1, 3, 4, 5 and 13 have been amended and claim 2 has been cancelled. The subject matter of dependent claim 2 has been added to claim 1. The dependencies of claims 3-5 have been amended in view of the cancellation of claim 2. Claim 13 has been amended to address a grammatical oversight. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter. Indeed, adequate descriptive support for the present Amendment should be apparent throughout the originally filed disclosure. Applicants submit that the present Amendment does not generate any new matter issue. Entry of the present Amendment is respectfully solicited. It is believed that this response places this case in condition for allowance. Hence, prompt favorable reconsideration of this case is solicited.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. Claims 2-5 and 10 were objected to and indicated as allowable if recast in independent form. By way of the present Amendment, the subject matter of dependent claim 2 has been added to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claim 1, as well as the remaining dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1 and 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miguelez et al. (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2003/0072337). Applicants respectfully traverse. The subject matter of dependent claim 2, which was not rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been added to independent claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection is moot.

Applicants note the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance included on page 2 of the Office action. Entry of that Statement into the record should not be construed as any

agreement with or acquiescence by Applicants in the reasoning stated by the Examiner. Applicants positions on the issues appear in Applicants' response. *Salazar v. Procter & Gamble Co.*, 414 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2005). The Statement of Reasons for Allowance should not be used to interpret the cited claims, particularly to the extent if any that the Statement of Reasons for Allowance may differ from the express language of the claims and/or Applicants' positions on patentability of those claims. It is respectfully submitted that the allowed claims should be entitled the broadest reasonable interpretation and broadest range of equivalents that are appropriate in light of the language of the claims, the supporting disclosure and Applicants' prosecution of the claims, without reference to the Statement of Reasons for Allowance.

It is believed that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request an early and favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application. If there are any outstanding issues which might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' representative at the telephone number shown below.

10/807,509

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Brian K. Seidleck  
Registration No. 51,321

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 BKS:idw  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: September 14, 2006**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.**